Mr. Fanning died May 9, 1874.
This is last. Ed's.

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORIAN.

T. FANNING, EDITOR.

VOL. 3. NASHVILLE, MAY, 1874. NO. 5.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

NEW SERIES NO. 5.

In previous issues of the HISTORIAN, we endeavored to give a faithful statement of the Scriptures, with reference to,

1st, *The Doctrine of Faith;*

2nd, *The Doctrine of Repentance;*

3d, *The Doctrine of Baptisms;*

and in the present issue, we invite attention to,

4th, THE DOCTRINE OF REMISSION OF SINS.

"The great commission," by our Savior, was delivered to the Apostles on Mount Olivet, just before he ascended to Heaven. In the Book of Matthew, it reads, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever, I have commanded you." (ch. 28: 19, 20.) The second biographer gives the commission:

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." (Mark 16: 16.)

The third witness, represents our Lord as saying: "Thus, it is written, and thus, it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins, should be preached in all the world in His name, begining at Jerusalem." (Luke 24: 47.)

The fourth gives it: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit, whosoever sins, ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins, ye retain, they are retained." (John 20: 23.)

Although, the commission, is written in a perspicuous and pointed style, it is scarcely probable, that any one would fully comprehend its full import, without carefully studying its practical applications in the labors of the Apostles. The Savior instructed his Ambassadors to "Tarry at Jerusalem, till endued with power from on high." They were to wait, till the Holy Spirit should descend to guide their tongues into all the truth. When Peter preached on Pentecost to the anxious multitude, he spake, "as the spirit gave him utterance," and as had been promised, "the very words" were given to him by the spirit.

The doctrine of the remission of sins, had been taught from an early date in the world's history, but till Christ, it had not been fully revealed. In the Jewish age, "remembrance of sin" was shadowed forthin types, in sacrificial purifications; and consequently, no one could assure his heart that he was freed from transgression.

Plenary remission, was revealed in the preperation of material for the kingdom of heaven. John "gave the people the knowledge of salvation, by the remission of sins;" but, "remission, in the name of Jesus Christ," was not understood, till the Spirit descended, on Pentecost. It had been recorded more than seven hundred years, that "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in all the world, in the name of Jesus, *beginning* at Jerusalem."

Whoever, therefore, will understand remission of sins, in its full spiritual import, must carefully study the subject in the light of history.

The Apostles, after the ascension, tarried at Jerusalem, till the Spirit descended, and enabled Peter to show the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel, and announce the glad tidings of salvation to a lost world. Many of the Jews who heard, "were pricked in their

hearts," or pierced to the soul by the marvelous truths uttered in the discourse of Peter, and all who believed, "cried out, men and brethren, what shall we do?" The Apostle, who had been especially ordained to give the inspired instruction, responded, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit: Then, they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the same day, there were added to them, about three thousand souls. (Ac. 2: 38—42.)

Thus, we have a satisfactory account of the first conversion, through the Spirit's teaching, and the first instance of remission of sins, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

If the scriptures, we have recited upon the subject of pardon, were understood and believed, nothing more would be needed upon the subject of the soul's salvation through the Gospel. In consequence, however, of the powerful influence, of other and conflicting teachings, on the subject, it is necesary to examine the whole question of pardon, as if nothing had been revealed.

Hence, we are under the necessity of making such inquiries, as may possibly lead some, to examine the matter from the beginning.

1st, What is meant by sin?

When we examine the creeds under which we have been trained, we discover that, sin is regarded as *constitutional* in our race. It is said, we are "totally depraved by nature." It is maintained that sin was entailed upon us from the progenitors of the race, and our supposed inherent corruption is called by the denominations, generally, our "Natural depravity," or our "Inbred sin."

As early as the latter part of the second century of the Christian era, it was supposed that every child born of Adam's race, was a vile sinner by nature,—wholly corrupt, and guilty before God, of damnable sin.

To prove this assumption, many scriptures, are confidently recited, a few of which, we will examine. The first passage, usually quoted, to prove natural and sinful corruption, is from David, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin, did my mother conceive me." (Warm me, H.) Ps. 51: 5. This is nothing more,

nor less, than a strong expression of a man of honest covictions, in reference to the practical delinquencies of his parents. Who his mother was, we know not, but on his father's side, he descended from the Moabitess Ruth, the purchased wife of Boaz, and David, doubtless, saw much in his ancestry, to seriously impress him with idea of frailty, in his parents.

We frequently hear the words of Isaih. 1: 5, quoted, "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint," to prove the inbred sin of humanity. The Prophet was not even distantly alluding to persons in a state of nature. He was speaking of Israel, as having gone away backward, and had as a nation, became very corrupt. The passage needs but a careful reading.

We frequently hear quoted from the New Testament, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins," "and were by nature, the children of wrath, even as others," to prove natural depravity. These clauses of supposed scripture, were manufactured by Romanists to sustain a false notion. The former fairly translated reads: "And you (Ephesian converts) are dead to the trespasses and to the sins, in which you formerly walked according to the course of this world," and the latter, "were by *practice*, (φυσει) the children of passion as others," (Eph. 2: 1—3.) Let scholars correct, if they can. But we are not disposed to offer any labored argument on the subject. Jesus said, "Suffer little children to come unto me. For of such, is the kingdom of heaven."

From the fancy that, infants are totally depraved, the doctrine of, "*baptismal regeneration*," as inculcated by the Romanish and English sects,—and as is substantially taught by all factions from them, had its origin. Even Mr. Wesley taught that, "Baptism to infants, takes away the guilt of the original sin."

While we know that we belong to a mortal race, we discover no evidence of personal guilt in our birth, and consequently, we can see no wisdom, in washing away sins, which do not exist—either as taught by pedo-Baptists, in water regeneration, or of a mystical spiritual regeneration, as inculcated by many Baptists.

The Apostle tells us, "Sin is a trangression of law, and where there is no law, there is no transgression." Therefore, we can but conclude, that such only as have violated God's laws are sinners and need pardon. At what age children become responsible, we presume, depends upon various contingencies. Some are but little removed, from an infantible and imbecile state, at twenty-one

years of age; whilst others, at eight or ten, are qualified for the service of God, or the wicked one. Whenever children become sufficiently advanced in intelligence, to discriminate, in the plain and simple practices of life, between what is morally right and wrong, they become responsible. When they can fully comprehend the moral import of, "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not lie," "Thou shalt not kill," they are fully competent to honor, or dishonor God.

We do not intend to intimate that, "Ignorance is bliss," or that all who die in ignorance, are fit subjects for the kingdom of heaven. Such a view, would make the Christian religion, a great curse, instead of a great blessing.

"We know not what *we* shall be," or what will be the state of the ignorant, degraded and immoral, in the future; but we well know, according to the scriptures, that such alone as are educated in this life for immortality, will be competent for heavenly behavior, or heavenly enjoyment in the future. The Savior will say, "Come in, you blessed of the Lord," "You have overcome the world, the flesh and the devil, therefore, enter thou into the joys of the Lord." The untrained and abandoned, will not be admitted into the heavenly city, but will go to their "own place." They are without—with "dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and whosoever loveth, and maketh a lie."

We can neither picture forth, as we have intimated, with any degree of certainty, the state of those who die aliens from God and slaves of the flesh, nor positively affirm, as John plainly intimates, "What we shall be;" but we have the assurance, that the "Sons of God shall be like their Lord, and shall see him as he is." None save the saints, will be with or see Jesus, in the heavenly state.

No one in this life, can serve God, or enjoy the blessings of Christ, who fails to become a member of the kingdom of heaven; or who is not pardoned, and takes not "the yoke of Christ." Our Lord, says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, take my yoke upon you and learn of me, and you shall find rest to your souls." To the wicked "there is no rest, but are like the troubled sea, whose waters cast up mire and dirt."

These things, we have thought proper to state, in order to show who really need the forgiveness of sins. We inquire,

2ND., WHAT IS THE MEANING OF REMISSION OF SINS?

Popular use or as the learned say, "*The usus Loquendi*," must govern in defining such expressions. We do not mean to say that, there is no clear scriptural, and authoritative signification of the word "pardon;" but we wish to suggest, that while persons are under the influence of false ideas, regarding the subject of remission, they are scarcely capable of appreciating the truth. Hence, the necessity of calling attention to some of the more popular opinions on the subject of remission. Many in this country grow up to manhood and womanhood, with the impression resting upon their hearts, that remission of sins, is something which they receive into what they call "their feeling heart." Hence, the general practice of seeking religion; and the profession of many, that, they have, "sought and found religion." It would be quite as intelligible, to affirm that, we have sought and found democracy and republicanism, or Judaism, as that we have, "got the religion of Christ." Such phraseology, indicates an exeeedingly low plane of human intelligence. Remission of sins, is no feeling "from within," or "direct evidence from without;" neither is any change of heart, or feeling of the soul, the slightest evidence, that one is pardoned.

We have already shown, that in all instances, faith works the requisite change of views, sympathies, and feelings of the heart, to enable one to obey understandingly the Gospel of our salvation. Such teachers, however, as attempt to make men believe that, the changes, which take place in the heart, from convictions of truth, or the belief of the truth, are evidence of remission of sins, are wholly incompetent to give spiritual instruction. The thousands on Pentecost, were pierced to the heart, and radically changed in the deep feelings of the soul, when they "Cried, men and brethren, what shall we do?" A marvellous revolution of feeling had taken place in their hearts, but they presumed not to conclude, this was remission of sins, or that they were sons and daughters of God by adoption.

King Agrippa, through the belief of Paul's preaching, was so thoroughly changed in his heart, that he said, "Paul, thou almost, persuadest me to be a Christian." Still, this change was no evi-

dence of forgiveness. Felix, the Governor, "Trembled, and said, 'go thy way, Paul, for the present, when more convenient, I will send for thee.'" Still he died, as we presume, out of Christ and was lost. He loved the honors of his station more than the honors of our Lord.

Saul of Tarsus, was thoroughly changed in heart by the words, "I am Jesus," and cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?," Still, with his changed heart and life, he had to hear from the lips of the servant Ananias, words by which to be saved, or what was revealed, in order to the remission of sins.

Thousands and tens of thousands of our bewildered fellow creatures, are laboring under the delusion, that conversion to God, and remission of sins, are either through feeling, or that a change of feeling, is at least the evidence of pardon.

Mr. Wesley taught, that such a change of feelings, as leads the soul to, "desire to flee the wrath to come," is quite sufficient for joining the church, as a seeker. If at the end of six months, the desire to be saved had increased and strengthened, the evidence of conversion is satisfactory by Mr. Wesley's brethren, and the person is received into full church membership.

Remission, in the view of modern revivalists, seems to us still, more mysterious. A reporter of the recent revival in St. Louis, conducted by the unequalled Hammond, says, "His first labor is to induce the multitude, to express a wish to come to Jesus. The next step, is to induce the Holy Spirit to show Jesus to the seekers; and thirdly, when the anxious can be led to *feel*, that they love Jesus, the operator pronounces them converted and pardoned, and their names are written in the covenant book."

This seems to be the general view of the most active American revivalists.

Such views, however, of remission of sins, we can not regard as scriptural.

The Greek word, *αφεσις*, occurs seventeen times in the New testament, and is rendered in our version nine times, *remission*, six *forgiveuess*, once, *deliverance*, and once *set at liberty*. The first occurrence is in the verse, "This is my blood of the New testament, which is shed for the the remission of sins." Mat. 26: 28. The last occurrence is in the passage, "I will make a New Covenant with them, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and write them in their minds. And their sins and iniquities, will I remember no more. Now, where re-

mission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." [Heb. 10: God, in the prophecy, is represented as keeping a book of remembrance, in which all the sins of our race, are faithfully recorded. In reference to the inefficiency of Jewish sacrifices, to take away sin, Paul said, "The blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh,;" but the Apostle asked, "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God," "Now in the end of the world, hath Christ appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself."

In putting away sins, they are blotted from the book of God's rememberance, and are remembered against us no more.

The verb, to remit, literally signifies, To *relax, release, abate relinquish, forgive, pardon, absolve,* to *send back.* God is often representded as releasing his "*ire.*" Milton wrote, "So willingly doth God remit his *ire.*" The Savior said to his Apostles, whose right it was, to stipulate the terms, "Whosoever sins, ye *remit,* they are *remitted* to them." But in every representation of remission, the act is God's. It takes place not in the heart o the erring, nor upon earth, but in the mind of our Heavenly Father. Parental forgiveness, is not a present to the child, but it is what takes place in the will, or heart of him or her, who decrees the *dismissing* of the offence.

But the still greater question is determine,

3RD., IN WHAT THE EVIDENCE OF PARDON CONSISTS.

Forgiveness is not a subject of mathematical certainty. With what degree of certainty, may we assure our hearts, that God has remitted our sins ? What is the character of evidence, offered in the New Testament ? We are glad to feel assured that, we can answer the question, in a manner to which no Christian can object.

The witness of the Spirit of God, to our hearts, that He has pardoned us,—blotted all of our past sins from the book of his remembrance, is the sole evidence on which we can rely. But do not Quakers, Shakers, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians—all denominations, make this identical profession ? John Rankin, the father of a Shaker village, assured us years since, that the

Spirit of God gave direct testimony to his spirit, that his sins were pardoned and his name was in the Lamb's Book of Life. Our protestant associates, uniformly make the same profession. Why then, do some who profess to have the witness of the Spirit that, they are pardoned, charge that, *we* do not have this witness? The difficulty, is easily solved. What, Quakers, Shakers, and modern revalists generally, denominate the witness of the Spirit, we regard as an idle dream, without the slight ground of authority from God. They claim a direct revelation, by *feeling* in the heart, as their spiritual witness; while we have no respect for the notion that, the Spirit ever made a revelation, or bore witness in, by, or through *feelings*, either good, or bad. This is the amazing deception of the age, and in all instance, it can but be, the result of extreme ignorance of the truth.

This bewitching hypothesis, assumes, that the Father in Heaven, is constantly, making revelations, by his spirit, to the most ignorant and degraded of earth, while for such a monstrous conclusion, there is no authority superior to the fleshly impulses, whatever. Since the "beloved Disciple," John, died, no inhabitant of earth, has received a revelation of the Spirit, by feeling or otherwise.

If our contemporaries will carefully examine into the influences of the theory of direct and continual revelations of the Spirit, if we are not very much mistaken, they will find not one, who even looks for such a direct witness, that believes the Bible, or has the lesst respect for any of its obligations. No, indeed, they depend upon no written records for their spiritual intelligence; and in the words of Doctor Harrison, in the spiritualistic debate with the impious Hull, "The sole evidence of spiritual truth, comes direct from God to the heart." But we forbear. It becomes our duty, to state clearly, how the spirit bears witness to our spirit that we are pardoned, and become heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ.

The spirit has ever borne witness in the same manner. Paul, said "I go bound in spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing what shall befall me there; save that, the spirit witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions await me." (Ac. 20: 23.) If the Holy Spirit bore witness to Paul, by *saying*—speaking to him and telling him, that bonds awaited him, we are asked, "How does the spirit *say* to us that we are pardoned." The testimony, employed by the spirit, is now and has always been the word of truth·

Hence God said, "I will put my laws into their hearts, and write them in their minds."

Upon examination, it will be clearly seen that, the spirit bore witness, by the "laws in the hearts, and written in the minds" of the saved. (Heb. 10: 15—16.)

The Apostle again, assures his brethren, that, "The spirit is ministered, by the *hearing* of faith." (Gal. 3: 2—5.) We consider that, we risk nothing, when we report, that in no age or condition of life, has the Holy Spirit, borne witness, been ministered to a soul, made a revelation, or imparted a single blessing, but through words addressed to the understanding heart. We appeal to all the examples, in the Bible, in proof of our conclusions, and we can but repudiate all professed witnesses, or revelations of the Spirit of God, by direct physical contact. God cast Saul to the earth, but there is no intimation it was by spiritual influence. The Comforter was sent first to the dsiciples on Pentecost, to bare witnesses to them that Jesus was the Christ, and that, their safety was in honoring him. They were also enabled to speak in the words of the Spirit, the wonderful works of God.

The evidence to others that, we are children of God, is exhibited in "The fruits of the Spirit, love joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness and goodness, against which there is no law."

We have stated that the evidence of remission of sins, rests not on mathematical certainty, and the question now is, with reference to the true and satisfactory ground of adoption into the family of God? Have we no assurance, higher than mere conjecture? Religion, as represented in the Scriptures, receives no strength from philosophical speculations, dreams, or fancy. To be sure, the prophet said, "He that hath a dream, let him tell a dream, but he that hath my word, let him speak of it faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith, the Lord." "What hath the Lord spoken?" (Jer. 23: 28, 35.) This is the great inquiry.

The Lord said by his inspired Apostle, "We walk, by faith, not by sight." (2d Cor. 5: 7.) We are also, exhorted to, "Be always ready, to give a reason, of our hope." When asked: "Why do we belivee that God has pardoned our sins?" what should be our reply? Our only answer should be, "That we confidently and joyfully *believe*, that our sins are blotted from the book of God's remembrance, and our names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life." It will be well to examine, how

faith, operates in giving our hearts this assurance of acceptance. A very simple illustration may throw light upon the subject. A father says to his offending son, upon a specified condition, "I will forgive you, my child." If the sin-convicted son has confidence in the promise of his father, he gladly accepts the terms, and in complying with the same, his glad heart leaps for joy, in the well grounded belief that his sins are no longer remembered. If however, the anxious child has any grounds for doubting the veracity of his father, he can never feel any strong assurance he is forgiven. When asked as to his feelings, his answer will be: "I do not know. I at least entertain serious doubts. My father so often deceives me, that I know not what to think or say. I have no assurance of pardon." But, should he have undoubted confidence in the father's promise, he will promptly respond, "Yes, indeed, I entertain no doubt as to my pardon, my father promised, and he has never deceived me." If the woman to whom the Savior said, "Thy sins are forgiven," (Lu. 7: 48.) had been questioned as to the *certainty* of the pardon of her many sins, her answer would have been, "I most confidently believe the Lord has forgiven me; for I doubt not he has the authority to speak pardon, and he told me, my sins were forgiven." This is faith, through the words of truth, and it is the only character of evidence, that any one can have, his, or her sins are forgiven. When the Pentecostians were told to, "Repent, and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," the assurance afforded through the promise of the inspired Peter, could leave no doubt as to the certainty, that the Father above forgave their past iniquities.

In this, and divers other examples, we see that forgiveness, is through law; and there is no more doubt of the fact, than there is, as to the truth of the law. Paul says, "For the law of the spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Hence, we discover that, forgiveness is not, through the law of Moses, or of ceremonies, but through the "Law of the Spirit," that was to "Go forth out of Zion." (Lu. 24: 47.)

CONDITIONS OF FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

When we speak of conditions of pardon, we do not mean to

intimate, that any work of wisdom of our own is a *procuring* cause of our cleansing from moral polution. When we have performed all that God requires, we are to feel and say, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done nothing more tnan our duty." We might also say in truth, "We can do nothing to *merit* salvation,—nothing, as a consideration, or equivalent, for so rich a boon." In the ordinances, there is nothing which *seems* appropriate to the philosophical thinker, in order to the forgiveness of the sinner. When the patient, however, takes medicine from the physician, there is a presumed power *in* the remedy to change the condition of the sufferer; but in the cleaning of the soul from sin, nothing can be discovered which indicates fitness, or could in our wisdom, prove absolutely valuable, as a remedial agent. What can anv one philosophically discover in baptism, prayer, the supper, fasting, or singing psalms, to make the soul better? The worth of the ordinances of religion, is not intrinsically in the performances, but solely in the *authority*, the value of the name, upon which penitents act. Peter said, "To him give all the Prophets witness, that, *through his name*, whosoever believes on him shall receive remission of sins." (Ac. 10: 45.) But unfortunately for the world, the professed teachers of the age, generally, can neither read correctly, nor understand, this plain passage of scripture. In the many discussions we have had upon the remissions of sins, this scripture was uniformly quoted, to prove that forgiveness is, "*through faith.*" It does not, so read, and such an idea is not in the words, or in the plan of redemption. In the teaching of the New Testament, no one is represented as pardoned, through the mere act of faith, however necessary faith may be, to lead the sinner into the requisite submission in order to forgiveness. The passage reads that, "through His name," believers have the promise of remission of sins. Governors of States, Presidents and sovereigns of all countries, possess authority, or power in their *names*, to forgive criminals. Christ gave a *law of forgiveness in His name*, or by his authority. Hence, we repeat, "All authority in heaven and upon earth" to pardon sinners, is "*in the name.*" Peter said to the blind and skeptical Jewish leaders, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the house of Israel, that, by the *name* of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, doth this man stand before you whole. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is *none other name*, under heaven given, whereby we must be saved." (Ac. 4: 10—12.) Surely from this very

lucid statement we can but see, the power to pardon is not in the ordinances, but in the *name*, of the Son of God.

Are we asked, "How are we blessed through the name of Jesus Christ?"

Where the name of a king is, there is his power; and where the name of God is placed, there also, is his power. To the Jews, God said, "Unto the place which I shall choose to put my name, there shall ye seek." (Deu. 12: 5.) God wrote his name in the *mercy seat*, in the most holy place, and for fifteen hundred years, prayers were not heard, when the suppliants looked not towards Jerusalem. Daniel, in Bablyon, three times in the day looked from his window in prayer toward Jerusalem, and God heard him. The name of Jehovah was in the temple, and this alone, gave worth, efficacy and power, to all acceptable supplications and services.

Jesus, our "*mercy seat*,"—our Propitiatory—ascended to the right hand of the Father, and upon what ever he has written his name, there is value in the service required.

The question then is, to ascertain, when, where, and upon what has the Lord inscribed his name, through the obedience to which life is promised? Before, however, answering this question, it is important to show, that there are two distinct classes of persons, equally interested in the pardon of sins, to whom the conditions of pardon are not identical, viz:

ALIENS, OR MEN WITHOUT, AND THE CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM.

How shall it be determined, that the terms of forgiveness are not identical, to the members of the church of Jesus Christ, and the members of Satin's empire. The scriptures, show plainly the conditions of the offenders differ so widely that they, require different remedies. One, for instance, who in the obedience of faith, has been brought into the spiritul family, may sin,—and perhaps all Christians sin—but his sin is that of a child, and the treatment must harmonize with his heirship. Men of the world, are required to believe, but if they refuse, no offer of mercy can be extended. Men who have not confessed the name of Christ, in obedience, have no right to pray in his name; they have no rights in a government to which they have not submitted. If

one, however, should sin after entering the fold of Christ, he may still call upon God in the name of his Savior. These conclusions, will be seen more clearly, in the examples, which will necessarily require attention.

WHAT HAS JESUS CHRIST REVEALED TO ALIENS, OR MEN OF THE WORLD, CALLED SINNERS, IN ORDER TO THE REMISSION OF SINS?

We think, we have already shown, that faith, and faith alone, works the requisite change of mind, heart, soul, temper and disposition of mind, to prepare the sinner to come savingly to Christ in obedience. If we are not deceived, we have also shown that believers, such as the convicted Pentecostians, are required to renounce the devil and all his ways, or to repent of their sins, before any acceptable service can be performed.

After the sinner has believed with all his heart, and repented of all his sins, God has ordained through his Son, the ordinance of baptism, in order to the remission of past sins; or as "the obedience of faith," through which the penitent believer "puts off the old man, and puts on the new man," It is in fact, the act prescribed, in the New Testament, through which the believer first publicly declares his allegiance to Jesus Christ. It constitutes the line of separation between the world and the church of God. It is not intended to cleanse the flesh, but it is the prescribed obedience into order to acquire a good conscience. Hence, Paul said, "As many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.)

Without offering any argument on this point, we state in great confidence, that when we examine the conversions recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, we find no christian, who has not believed with the whole heart the Savior, repented of all sins, and upon confession of the name of Christ, submitted to him in baptism.

WHAT DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH WITH REFERENCE TO THE OBEDIENCE OF CHRISTIANS WHO HAVE ERRED, IN ORDER TO ACCEPTANCE?

The "Beloved disciple" said to Christians, "Little children, if any one sin, we have an Advocate with the Father," or one, to call us back to God—and "He is a mercy seat for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

The Apostle added, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleans us from all unrighteousness."

Again he said, "And whatever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do these things which are pleasing in his sight."

But *thus*, he spake, not to the world, or to such, as had not obeyed frcm the heart, "that form of doctrine," prescribed in order to enter the kingdom of God's son. Finally, the Apostle said, "This is the confidence we have in him, that, if we (we Christians—not the world) ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." "If any one (any christian) see his brother sin, a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them, that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it." (1 John 5: 14—16.) Christians then, who offend, are required to repent, and confess their sins, and pray to God in the name of Jesus Christ in order to pardon, and all, except such as have not sinned unto death, have the assurance of pardon.

But to men of Satan's kingdom, to aliens, the law of remission prescribed by inspiration on Pentacost, is alone applicable. At another time, we may answer objections, and reconcile apparent contradictions.

THE EXPERIENCE OF AN EARNEST MAN.

A paper published, if I mistake not, in Alton, Ill., gives the experience of a man long asteemed and respected by his fellow citizens. There has been much interest on the subject of religion, since the preaching of Mr. Hammond in that town, and many have been added to the different churches. Mr. Cyrus Edwards, Ex-Governor of Ill., presented himself, a few Sundays ago, to the Baptist Church, in N. Alton, a candidate for baptism. A vote was taken, to determine, whether or not he was a suitable subject. All were willing to receive him. "Thank God," was his grateful exclamation, on hearing the decision. The experience is long, and I will give only a few items. Of the first meeting at which he felt interested for his own salvation. He says, "I listened eagerly if not hopefully, to the account of Christian experience, and became more and more concerned for my personal salvation, I attended meeting day and night for two weeks. At the close, I, feeling no evidence of conversion, made no professon of religion.

"At the age of thirty, I was again brought under conviction. There was a great awakening and many conversions, but concerned as I was, I could recount no experience, that I could accept as evidence of conversion, and so I fell back again." Seven weeks ago, I said to some of my firends "How joyful it would be if I could have the faith of a christian." One of them brought me a tract "The Blood of Jesus," I read it and was forced to believe I could do nothing to merit or secure my salvation. I felt I had sinned away my day of grace, in living so long in the rejection of my Savior. After reading the book a second time, I prayed, "Lord save or I perish." "Lord be merciful to me a sinner." After this time, a gleam of hope come into my soul, I realized my dependence on Christ, and my faith was reaching out after him. My heart leaped to embrace the promise, "He that believeth on the Son, has eternal life." I felt such a relief and in this simple faith and trust, that I ventured to indulge a *faint hope* that my sins were forgiven. I feel daily more hopeful in reference to my impressions. I hope I may be brought to greater nearness and conformity to Jesus Christ, and present myself as a candidate for baptism, if thought worthy."

On reading the experience of this earnest man I could not help contrasting the religious teachings of the present day, with that given by Jesus to his disciples, for the acceptance of every sinner who feels his need of a Savior, and is willing to take him as his Redeemer, brother and friend. There are many like Mr. E., who live long, without hope and without God in the world, only because they do not know what to do. They do not reject Christ, but know not how to come to him. They would come with their whole hearts and souls, devoting all their being to him, if the way were not so dark. This is the case with some of the most sensible men and women. Some never become religious.

A few months ago, not far from us, an humble woman, who had prayed forty years "to get religion," fell from her horse and died, without any being granted to her. If God had promised it as the reward of earnest prayer, would he have failed to give it? Sooner would the heavens fall! Poor soul, there was not a day in those long sad years, she would not have submitted to the Savior had she known how—There was not a day that, the Savior did not lovingly invite her to him—not a day that he would not have pardoned her sins and blessed her with the knowledge of it.

This delay was not known, when Christ's religion was given to men. Men and women did not wait forty or seventy years. Pardon of sin was first offered to the murderers of Christ, There was a law of pardon, and sinners believed, if there was truth in the word of God, they had all the evidence of conversion that God himself required.

When a Jew sinned he took to the temple, a lamb. The Priest made the offering, the sinner confessed his wrong, and the declation was, "He shall be pardoned." One ignorant of the Jewish law, sees him going to the priest with his lamb, and inquires, where are you going? He answers, I have sinned against God, and I am going to be pardoned. On his return, he is questioned again. Are you bardoned? I am. I have done what the law required, and if there is truth in the word of God, my sin is forgiven.

Pardon, in the religion of Christ, is as certain as it was in the Jewish religion. As before said, it was offered first to the murderers of Christ, and they joyfully accepted it on the same day. Three thousand at the first meeting became rejoicing christians. At the next, five thousand and then, multitudes both of men and

women. This is the compassion of a God. He does not give to some; and leave poor sorrowing souls to weep that he withholds his blessings from them. Peter convinced these murderers that it was the Son of Heaven's king, they had crucified. They had raved around him when on the cross, like dark spirits from hell, but when they believed he was God's own son, they cried out in terror, and asked what they must do. Peter told them to repent and be baptized for the remission of sin. The belief in Christ, he had implanted, changed their hearts. Repentance changed their lives, and baptism changed their state. By this last act, they were translated from the kingdom of Satan, into the kingdom of God's dear Son. They became at once the children of God, with all the evidence of conversion, that God himself required. He told them to be baptized for the pardon of sin. Could he fail to forgive, after they had believed in Christ, repented and submitted to him in baptism? They then took him for their Redeemer and Savior, and devoted their lives to him. Many suffered martyrdom for their faith in him whom they had crucified. Now when God has given his Son to die that sinners may be saved, will he refuse anything else?

If a man should give up a pure, a holy son, to save his friends or enemies, is there anything else half so valuable? Is there anything else in life he would refuse. Would he be willing that these persons should have faint hopes of salvation when he had done so much to make them happy, and secure their eternal bliss? The study with all should be, "What does God say." The first four writers of the New testament have one object in view; to prove that Christ is the Son of God the Savior of sinners. The book of Acts teaches, how men in ancient times, submitted to Christ—became christians, and the Epistles were written to these christians to enable them to live christian lives. Sad it is, when earnest men and women are mourning to know the love of Christ, are trembling with anxiety to become his followers, that they are are kept back by the idea of their own unworthiness. The Savior calls them to come with all their sins about them, and though they have been crimson, they shall be white as snow. He pardoned his murderers, received them as his followers, and it would seem that none should despair when his love and pity were first extended to them. Suppose, when the disciples had received the law of pardon, in the words of the spirit, from the lips of Christ, they had taken a vote to determine whether the

murderers of their Lord should be their brethren in his kingdom. Christ tenderly calls sinners to come to him and he will give rest. Shall we vote whether they are fit to come? The earnest study of every human being should be: What does God say in his word? How does he tell sinners to come to him? We can learn if we open his book without prejudice or prepossession, and study it with sincere desire to know its contents. Should not systems that keep humble men and women from coming to Christ, for long, long, weary years, be considered and reconsidered? If not in accordance with God's word, would it not be better to do as he says, and bow to him on his own terms of faith, repentance and baptism?

C. F.

CHURCH SCHOOLS;

or,

THE DUTY OF CHRISTIANS, IN THE EDUCATION OF YOUTH.

The education of youth, is as clearly a defined Christian work, in the New Testament, as the preaching of the Gospel to the world. Still, we have a hundred articles, essays, sermons, and exhortations, in our church periodicals and religious publications, upon the obligations of Christians to preach the Gospel to the lost, where we have a single sentence, in reference to the training of the children committed to our charge. Whence this difference, in the direction of our energies? Is the conversion of sinners, of more importance than the training of our people for the practice of godliness? Is, the merely nominal conversion of the world to Christ, half so important in its moral and spiritual aspects, as the christian instruction of ourselves and our children for immortality? Why is it, that we can find, at least a hundred persons, excited to become members of churches, where we can discover a single well educated man, or woman, for the moral obligations of life?

These grave inquiries, suggest to us, the necessity of at least, a brief examination of the matters involved in our caption.

THE FIRST OBLIGATION, ON THE PEOPLE OF GOD, IN THE JEWISH AGE, WAS EXHIBITED IN THE MORAL EDUCATION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COVENANT.

"Honor thy father and mother, was the first commandment, with promise," under the law by Moses. God said, "These are the commandments and statutes and the judgments, that thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his commandments, all the days of thy life; that thy days may be prolonged. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is our Lord. And thou, shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words that, I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart." (Deu. 6: 1—6.)

Such were the requirements for the people of age—for the fathers and mothers of Israel. The second lesson consisted in,

THE OBLIGATION TO TEACH THE LAW, TO THE YOUTH OF THE LAND.

God said, "And thou, shalt teach these words diligently to thy children, and shall talk of them, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name." (Deu. 6: 7—14.)

Such were the lessons to be taught to the children of the people of the Lord. Long after this, Solomon said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." (Prov. 22: 6.)

We invite attention next, to the instructions to Christians in regard to

THE EDUCATION OF THEIR CHILDREN.

The lessons are equally specific. Paul said, "And, ye fathers,

provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph, 6: 4.)

The best rendering of the Greek word, *Παιδεια*, here translated, "*nurture*," is *education*, or *training*. It is found six times in our Scriptures, and is rendered here, *nurture;* in 2 Tim. 3: 6, it is translated, "*Instruction*," in righteousness; and in four instances, it is, "*chastening*," or *chastisement*." The word *education*, necessarily involves the idea of *instruction, chastening, training* and *purifying*.

A volume of weighty reasons might be written, in favor of the Christian training of children. If there is, in fact, a more important obligation resting upon the disciples of Jesus Christ, than the prcper instruction and discipline of children, we cannot call it to mind. At present, however, we submit, for the considertion of the thoughtful, but two arguments in favor of the proper training of children. In the first place, converts, who are not morally trained in youth, are seldom able to stand firm in their christian profession. We presume that, more than nine-tenths of the awakened, in the revivals and protracted meetings, fall away. Summer converts, made by inflammatory harangues, are seldom, if ever, able to maintain their religious integrity through the frolicing season, of the first winter.

Secondly—If the people of God take not charge of the education of their children, others must take their place, in this most responsible labor, and parents may often have cause of sore grief at their fatal mistakes. Christian parents, who abandon their children to the baneful influences of Romish, or any other partisan privolities, under the name of fashionable education, will have a fearful account to render in the day of Judgment.

With these suggestions, we beg leave, to invite the attention of the brethren to such departments of youthful training, as seem to us most pressing.

IST.—FAMILY EDUCATION.

There can be no question in reference to the obligations resting upon parents, to teach their children and dependents, in the ways of the Lord. Morning, noon and evening, each father and mother, should be most careful to instil into the minds of their offspring, lessons of truth and righteousness. Their attention should be constantly directed to God, to Heaven, and to right-

doing. If children are left to the direction of fleshly impulses, they can but go astray; and after entering their teens, in animal gratifications, it is next to an impossibility to recover them, from the downward road. In our long experience in the education of youth, it is a difficult thing to call to mind, a "*bad boy*," that made a gentleman, or became truly a Christian. A girl, indeed, brought up in the lightness and frivolities of the age, seldom, if ever, sobers down into the modesty and self-denial, requisite for a pure and christian life. Hence, parents, who fail to teach God's word to their children, and impress their young hearts with the love of what is sacred, pure and heavenly, act not their true part as servants of God. We remember a professedly Christian father, whom we asked, "If his daughter," who had professed a desire to be baptized into the Savior, "was sufficiently instructed to obey understandingly?" He replied with a good degree of emotion, "I do not know." * * "The subject of religion is of so delicate a character, that I have not talked to her on the subject." Is not this, the condition of many church members amongst us? Are there not christian parents, who never prayed, or even gave thanks to God, in the presence of their children? Parents, as a general rule, must be truly religious people, before their children can appreciate their responsibilities to God and to themselves. Hence, the family school, is the first in the divine order.

2ND.—THE SUNDAY SCHOOL IS NOT TO BE FORGOTTEN.

Had we space, we would take deep interest in the discussions of various questions, connected with the labor of Sunday schools. A few, brief conclusions, however, must suffice. We are not pleased with the form, "*Sunday Schools*;" and the phrase, "*Sabbath Schools*," is entirely too Jewish for Christian lips. We have, in the New Covenant, "The first day of the week," and "The Lord's-day," and we can see no good reason, why Christians should not prefer the style, "Lord's-day Schools," or "Lord's-day Work." As to the particular mode of conducting Lord's-day schools, or Sunday schools, we offer but a thought or two.

The main matter is, that christian parents, should be careful that, their children spend their Sundays in useful labor. The day is not for rest, visiting or frolicing; but it is above all others,

the day for the most active employment, in studying what is morally useful and good. It, therefore, cannot be doubted, that it is the duty of parents and the whole church, in every place, to spend the day mainly in such studies and moral exercises, as may most closely comport with Christian obligations and life.

Children, who cannot read, *may* be taught to read in the Sunday school; but Christian parents, should attend to this work at home.

The Bible, the geography of the Bible, the history of the Bible, the men and women of the Bible, the life required in the Bible, and the promises of the Bible, should employ the attention of youth on the Lord's-day. It strikes us, that the *Church*, is the Sunday school revealed, and we very much question the propriety of any other organization for religious instruction.

3RD.—WEEK-DAY SCHOOLS. PRIMARY EDUCATION.

We think, there should be no doubt, as to the obligation that rests upon Christians, to take the entire control and direction of week-day schools for the education of their own, and such other children, as may be entrusted to them.

4TH.—ACADEMICAL, AND COLLEGE EDUCATION.

We can see no good reason, why Christians should not have the exclusive control of all the higher schools of learning, to which their children are entrusted. We do not indeed, consider any man or woman, at all *competent* to have the responsibility of educating youth, who fears not God, and who is not, in the fullest sense, a Christian. We have frequently, in our educational efforts, been induced to engage the irreverent and ungodly as teachers, but the results, we have ever regretted. Irreligious teachers, and school managers, are dangerous directors in the education of youth.

We are reminded that, very great care, is often taken, by even christian school directors, to satisfy the public, that there is nothing "*peculiar*," or as they sometimes say, "*partisan*," in their schools. This favors ignorance, or duplicity. It is true, there is nothing, especially partisan, in the mathematical and scientific departments of education, but schools, without correct moral training, are a curse, in all countries. The idea, of Chris-

tians conducting merely skeleton schools, or giving their precious time and energies, to the dry bones of mere scholastic learning, is a barren conception of our obligations to God, and to our fellow creatures.

Schools amongst us, or to which we commit the education of our children, should be under the entire direction of Christians, and *none*, but Christians.

This conclusion, involves, the main questions, that are so deeply exciting our brethren in Kentucky, in reference to which, we have been reluctant to utter a word. While, however, we may possibly most successfully present our views on the subject of school management, by reference to what seem to us radical mistakes, in even great and good men, we venture, a few plain conclusions. We can readily call to mind a serious error in the school management of our Bro. A. Campbell, in permitting into the classes of Bethany, a speculative professor, through whose transcendental influence, the Russel and Carman heresy originated.

We have staring us in the face, at this moment, the fatal error of our brethren in Kentucky, in admitting a mixed "Curatorship" of Jews, Infidels, and Christians, in our wealthiest and once, most popular school. Such alliances, are unholy, pernicious and ruinous, in all Christian effort for the training of youth. In a previous issue, we incidently alluded to the terrible mistake, in wording the charter, as to place their property in the hands of a worldly-wise and independent board, that scrupled not, to put the "Disciples of Christ" at defiance, as to their just rights. Bro. W. H. Hopson's sharp reply, was unfortunate. Sensible people, can but see things as they really exist.

Think of it, brethren. A professed "*Bible School*," under the direction of Jews and Atheists, and your most popular Professor, mercilessly decapitated by a combination of religion, politics, "the world, the flesh and the devil." If wiser counsels should not prevail, "our boasted Kentucky university, will be lost to the church of God;" and the brethren of Tennessee and other States, who so liberally contributed of their means, will be robbed of their hard earnings, and the cause of Christ, will be dishonored by its professed friends.

In justice, however, to both sides, we are pleased to say, we have their word, that they ardently desire, to direct affairs in a manner, that will secure to all concerned, their rights. In conclusion, we must say to the leaders of both parties, that they

have, as we believe, blindly erred and sinned against the brethren and the cause of the Savior, and it is their duty to God and their people to *stand aside*, and let wiser and better men, bring peace and prosperity, from the wreck, of their misdirected and most unfortunate proceedings.

Our sole object, is to aid, if possible, the true friends of the cause of Christ, in their well intended efforts to educate the youth of the age.

We need schools, under *Christian* influence, in every State, county and section of our country, and we hope the time is not far distant, when all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, will heartily co-operate in the momentous work of Christian education. Come, dear Brothren, let us reason together. We are but one people, and let our purposes and labors, be one.

RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS.

As intimated in our April issue, we consider it proper to, at least, occasionally, call attention to such publications on religious subjects, as are circulating amongst the brethren. We feel much more interest in productions which are likely to exercise a wide influences in the churches, than in the merely literary and scientific works of the times. While the many popular novels of the age, are eagerly sought and anxiously read, by the light-minded and frivolous, they possess no real charms for persons concerned in regard to the way which leads to eternal life. Neither can we find anything in the metaphysical productions in circulation, of value, to a people who desire to know the truth, as written by the finger of God. We may safely say also, that works on speculative theology, such as those of, Darwin, Huxley and Renan, contain not a single promise, or the faintest ray of light, to any people who are seeking for "glory, immortality and eternal life."

The fact is, that no one that is striving to become wise unto salvation, can find leisure to wade through the fictious and empty theories which are entirely destitute of practical interest. We can not "serve God and mammon," nor safely divide our

precious time, between speculations and the Divine oracles.

The slight interest that has possibly been excited by our very imperfect examination of some of the fancy notions of the times upon the subject of Church organization, has brought to our table, several quite thoughtful treaties, with reference to various points of discussion amongst us. Brief notices of a few of them, may stimulate some of the brethren to examine the scriptures more earnestly.

1ST.—"THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, AND ITS GOVERNMENT."

By Elder J. Hartzel, of Davenport, Iowa.

Brother Hartzel, has sent us a book of 141 pages, evincing great research in reference to the matters suggested in the above caption, No one can examine these pages, without becoming fully satisfied, that the author, is an earnest student of the Scriptures. His main conclusions, we regard, as correct, and where read, the work can but do good. The main question discussed, is church government; and without attempting to embody the details, it must suffice to say, there seem to be two quite opposite theories, operating upon the mind of the writer, in the prosecution of his labor.

In the first place, he seems to be combating the notion that church government, or church discipline, is in the hands of Delegated persons, called Elders, Overseers, or Bishops."

While our Brother admits, that such officials are in the church, he labors to prove that, their action is not independent of the appointing power, and of the course that final action in every instance, must be, by and with the consent of members of the respective congregations. He, however, uses the rule given by the Savior, "Tell it to the church, and if he will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," with signal effect. This instruction, indeed, faithfully heeded, will save the saints from many errors in action, and very much incline them to listen to what is written.

The directions, also, given by Paul in regard to the incestuous man—"Concerning him that hath so done this deed. [Taken his father's wife.] In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the

destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," are without doubt, scriptually applied. A few sentences from the "conclusion," will sufficiently indicate the direction of our Brother's teaching.

He says, "All we have on the government of the church, is in the New Testament. The Scriptures do not give representative authority to church officers, therefore, before our elders can act in a representative capacity, they must obtain the consent of the memberships." "The congregation must have a voice in the executive administration, or elders are by virtue of their office," "Lords over God's heritage."

Will our Brother Hartzel suffer us to ask him a few questions, on the points involved?

If the Apostle, exhorted the brethren at Corinth, to "Put away from among themselves, that wicked person," (1 Cor. 5: 13) what right have men called elders, or officers, to meddle with it? The delivering over to Satan, seems to have been, the exclusive business of the members. Did not the church at Ephesus, "Try them that said, they were Apostles, and were not, and found them liars." (Rev. 2: 2.) If such is the province of the churches, it certainly cannot be the business of the delegated members, or hired pastors over them.

We remember, it is written, that Paul said to the senior members of the church at Ephesus, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." (Ac. 20: 28.) Did not "God set the members, as it pleased him in the body?" and especially, ordain the more experienced members to overlook, and direct in all church matters? If they fed the flock, they were doubtless, shepherds, or pastors; and if they overlooked the members, who needed help, they were *overseers*, or *bishops*, but why call them, especially officers, more than any other workers in the body?

If you are correct, dear Brother, in your statement on page 51, that the "*Apostles, left the administration of authority in the church;*" and on page 64, that, "*Christians, rule by example rather than by authority,*" we might have ground for questioning the correctness of your suggestion that, elders, or bishops, as officers, or *men of authority*, were in the primitive churches. Will our Brother please re-examine this question, with his usual earnestness?

2D.—"AN EARNEST INQUIRY INTO THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES OF GOD IN CHRIST JESUS."

By B. K. Smith :—Indianapolis, Ind.

We thank, Brother Smith, for his book of 104 pages on the subject of church organization. The concluding chapter, plainly indicates our Brother's views. A sentence, or two, will satisfy our readers, that the conclusions are, in the main, sound and safe He says, "The entire church is God's *clergy*, to which the surrounding is the, *laity*. Every member of the church is either a *servant*, or *handmaid* of God, for the propigation of his grace to the world."

Our deep regret is, dear Brother, that our brethren are not universally co-operating for the salvation of mankind. Again, our Brother says, (page 89,) "Persons were devoted to special service of a temporary character, as the seven at Jerusalem." This we cordially believe; but that, the churches, or others, made, by laying on hands, elections or otherwise, permanent officers—with perpetual and universal authority, as in the denominations and amongst the disciples, the writer does not believe.

Will our aged and highly respected Brother Smith, consent to re-examine the question, of *offices*, *officers*, and *ordination*, with reference to the application of the words, as used by all the sects, and by many, who say they are governed by the Bible alone?

3d., We have also before us, quite an earnest communication, by an aged servant of Jesus Christ, W. Stringer, of Alabama, on

"THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH."

A few extracts will show how our Brother reads the Bible He says, "The Holy Spirit directs what work, the respective members of the church, shall perform; the Evangelists, are to see that each is in his proper place, and all the members, are to aid in carrying out the Divine regulations."

This sounds well in our ears. Brother Stringer reads and believes the Bible.

4th, We notice, however, indications of alarm amongst our editors. Brother Franklin, of the *Review*, seems really excited at the struggle in some quarters for the authority of "*one Bishop*" in each church. If officers, are really men of authority, the

fewer we have in each congregation, the better for the members and the world. We only wonder that, Brother F. did not sound the alarm sooner. If our Brother, who is, no doubt, most sincere in his apprehensions, will spend even a short time in the study of his Bible, with reference to his own teaching, touching men of *authority*, in the churches, we presume he will change somewhat, his style of attack. He will at least cease to hint, and thrust at men in the dark. He will in fact, speak out plainly, with a voice that all can understand. He will also see that, Scriptural Elders, Overseers, Bishops, Deacons, and Fathers, are merely church members, who take their distinctive titles from their daily labor, and not from any popish ceremonies. While we think, we understand the Scriptures on this matter, we will not dogmatize, and we would not offer a remark to prevent our Brother from exposing error in high and low places. There is work at hand, for all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. We especially, need *co-operative* labor amongst our writers. Let us, bear with each other, brethren.

MORTIFYING.

In the April number of the HISTORIAN, we were deeply mortified to see, "Rev.," prefixed to the name of Bro. W. K. Pendleton. We wrote it, Pres. W. K. Pendleton, and our typographer's false notion led him, no doubt, to imagine that, all preachers are entitled to the popish designation—"*Reverend.*" In the past forty years, we have been in constant correspondence with ministers of the Gospel, and to no one's name, did we ever prefix "*Reverend,*" and should we ever be guilty of so great an impropriety, it should be concluded, that our thoughts have become wayward, or that we have lost respect for the simple forms of speech in the New Testament. Those styled clergyman, in the church of Rome and England, are called, "*Reverend,* Bishops, *right Reverend,* and arch Bishops, *most Reverend*;" and in all sects under popish influence, the "*Officials*" rejoice to be called "*Reverend.*" Such designations, however, are adverse to the style, spirit and genius of the religion of the Son of God; and men who understand and love the truth, never employ them.

Our translators made Paul exhort, "Wives, to *reverence* their husbands," (Eph. 5: 33,) but in the Greek, it is to *fear*, not *revere.* The Apostle exhorts the brethren to "Fear God," and "Honor the king," but no man is authorized to *revere* his fellow man. Paul earnestly exhorted the "Brethren, to consider well their laborers in the Lord, and to *esteem* them very highly in love, for their work sake. (1 Thes. 5: 13.) No man is to be respected but for his good behavior, and every species of respect on account of *place*, or *office*, is sheer idolatry, anti-christian, and spiritually pernicious.

THE NEW BIRTH.

Bro. Fanning: In the February number of the RELIGIOUS HISTORIAN, you speak of the New Birth, and ask, "Is it a birth by water and the spirit? Or are there two birhts? One of water, and the other, by the spirit? Is there a birth of the inner man, and another birth of the outward man?"

In answer to the first question, I say no! In answer to the last two questions, I say, there is a birth of the *inner man*, and another birth, of the *outward man.*

The birth of the Holy Spirit is one of more interest, and one less understood, than, perhaps, any other portion of the Scriptures. I verily believe, when once the birth of the Spirit is properly understood, the good, of earth, will be one in Christ.

Before discussing this subject, however, I wisn to call attention to the Lord's Commission. Our Savior said to his Apostles, "All power in heaven and on earth, is given unto me, and as I am about ascending to my Father in heaven, do you go to Jerusalem, and there remain until I am crowned King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; then I will come in the Spirit, and use you and your tongues as earthen vessels to plant my church, which has long been promised, and I will then give such laws and make such promises as I please, and every soul that fails to obey my voice, I will require it of him."

In Acts 2, I learn that the spirits of 3,000 persons were made alive to righteousness, while their bodies were dead with Christ to sin. It was only the spirits of the 3,000, that were in the kingdom or church, and not the body; hence, to get the body or outward man into the kingdom, Christ said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

God said to Abraham, all kindreds of the earth shall be blessed in him, because Abraham staggered not at the faith, but believed what God had promised, he was able to perform. Hence God gave him credit for righteousness,—who against hope, believed in hope, that he might be the father of the faithful, and he received therefore, the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith he had, being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all that believe,

I, therefore, conclude, the covenant God made with Abraham, for the first time, commenced being fulfilled in the 3,000 who

staggered not at the grand central idea in the scheme of redemption, that Jesus was the Christ, the Savior of a lost and sinning world, and immediately perfected their faith in works of righteousness, by being buried in baptism. The death to sin—thereby, making their bodies fit for the indwelling of Christ, for Christ never dwells in any one until the body is dead to sin. After the 3,000 were dead to sin he dwelt in them, but this is not the birth of the outward man, nor is it the birth of the Holy Ghost that our Savior speaks of in John 3: 5; neither is it the gift of the Holy Spirit promised in Acts 2: 38, as some teach, for Christ in the Spirit being present with the Apostles was fully able to translate the spirits of the 3,000 out of Satan's kingdom into the new kingdom, but did not translate the outward man of the 3,000. Therefore, in Acts 2: 38, God seals the outward man with the Holy Spirit of promise. This is the *birth of the body from the tomb*, which we do not attain unto until the day of judgment, when God's Son from heaven, before we can be partakers of the divine nature in his everlasting kingdom, that will appear with him, for which we are to suffer.

We look in the direction of Galilee, and see Christ demanding of John the righteous act of burial in baptism, thereby, justifying the laws of his Father.

For three years, he fed the hungry, healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, unstopped deaf years, healed the maimed and raised the dead—and without cause did his own countrymen put him to death. He was buried in Joseph's new tomb, and the third day his outward man was born of the spirit. The birth from the Jordan was for his inner man, and the birth from Joseph's new tomb was for the outward man. Hence, Christ attained to eternal life when he was born from Joseph's new tomb. After he arose, he could not then have been put to death again. The birth of water is for our spirits, and the birth of the spirit is for our bodies.

We can at once see the fitness of his spiritual house, or kingdom on earth, which we should hold fast, "The form of sound words," and all spake the truth in love, for if we love not the truth of the Gospel on earth, in eternity, we cannot love as brethren. After Christ had been born of water and the spirit, not only his body, but even the scars in his hands and his pierced side were fully identified, which will forever satisfy good men that Darwin's transmigration theory is false and worthless, for we are to be like him, and known as we are known.

Paul said, "that Christ was the first born from the dead." (Col. 1: 17.) In Rom. 8: 22—23, he wrote, "We know that the whole creation groaneth and trevaileth in pain until now, and not only they, but we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit: the redemption (birth) of our bodies, or the awakening of our outward man from the dead. The outward man of Paul is yet to be born."

You will say then, we are children of promise and counted for

the seed. So we are! Having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, when Christ shall come to be glorified in his saints, and be admired by all that believe in that day.

V. B. WALKER,

Paris, Tenn.

REMARKS.

In looking over the foregoing article, some will, no doubt, consider the main conclusions quite novel, to say the least. While we have no disposition to endorse the truth of all the statements of our esteemed correspondent, we will do him the justice to say, that in our judgment, his views are not more fanciful, than those of the denominationalists generally, and in fact, than many of our own writers. In the past forty years of our pilgrimage, we have carefully read everything we could find on the subject of the "New birth," and while we have thought that we understood it, we admit there are difficulties, and therefore, we should not be surprised at any theory.

If the notion of two births is true, one of the *inner*, and another of the *outward* man, our Brother's theory is quite as plausible as any we have noticed. It will be noted that, Brother Walker places, what he calls, "The birth of water," for the spirit of man, or the *inward* man, which takes place in this life; and the birth by the spirit is for the *outward* man, and takes place in the resurrection. Our Protestant brethren generally, are quite ready writers and speakers, in reference to what they call the "Birth of the spirit," which they say, "takes place in the pardon of sins," and is known by "the change of feelings." Our Brother Campbell said many good things in regard to a birth of the spirit and a birth of the water. Since his time, our esteemed Bro. Moses E. Lard, has written exegitically, logically, and really critically, about the two births; or the quickening by the spirit, through the truth, and the burial and resurrection in baptism.

Quite recently, a good writer in the Apostolic times, said some pretty things on the subject of, "That which is born of the spirit, is spirit, and that which is born of the flesh, is flesh;" but no one of the theories, seems to us entirely correct. At present, however, we will engage in no discussion of the subject. Our purpose is at an early date, to say, our say, upon the vexed question of the new birth; and therefore, we must, for the time, satisfy ourself with a few negative thoughts.

To us, there seems but one birth. It is said to be, "A birth from above;" and persons are said to be, "Born of God." It is a *new creation*, a *passing from death to life*, is said to be a "Birth of water and spirit." In our version, it is said (Jno, 3: 8), "So is every one born of the spirit;" but in Tischendorf, it is, "*So is every one born of water and the spirit.*"

To us, there is but one birth, to enter the church of God, and all other views seem to us equally speculative, and yet, we are willing to prove all things, and hold fast the good.